

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

CISCO SYSTEMS INC,
 Plaintiff,

v.

ARISTA NETWORKS, INC.,
 Defendant.

Case No. [14-cv-05344-BLF](#)

**ORDER GRANTING ARISTA'S
 ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE
 MATERIAL UNDER SEAL**

[Re: ECF 191]

Before the Court is Arista's administrative motion to file material under seal. ECF 191. For the reasons stated below, the motion is GRANTED.

I. LEGAL STANDARD

There is a "strong presumption in favor of access" to judicial records. *Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003)). A party seeking to seal judicial records bears the burden of overcoming this presumption by articulating "compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings that outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure." *Id.* at 1178-79. Compelling reasons for sealing court files generally exist when such "court files might have become a vehicle for improper purposes," such as the use of records to gratify private spite, promote public scandal, circulate libelous statements, or release trade secrets." *Id.* (quoting *Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978)). However, "[t]he mere fact that the production of records may lead to a litigant's embarrassment, incrimination, or exposure to further litigation will not, without more, compel the court to seal its records." *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179. Ultimately, "[w]hat constitutes a 'compelling reason' is 'best left to the sound discretion of the trial court.'" *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1097 (9th Cir. 2016).

"Despite this strong preference for public access, [the Ninth Circuit has] carved out an exception," *id.* at 1097, for judicial records attached to motions that are "tangentially related to the

merits of a case,” *id.* at 1101. Parties moving to seal such records need only make a “particularized showing” under the “good cause” standard of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c). *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1180 (quoting *Foltz*, 331 F.3d at 1138).

In this District, parties seeking to seal judicial records must furthermore follow Civil Local Rule 79-5, which requires, *inter alia*, that a sealing request be “*narrowly tailored* to seek sealing *only* of sealable material.” Civil L.R. 79-5(b) (emphasis added). Where the submitting party seeks to file under seal a document designated confidential by another party, the burden of articulating compelling reasons for sealing is placed on the designating party. *Id.* 79-5(e).

II. DISCUSSION


Arista moves to seal portions of the reply brief in support of its motion for leave to amend its response to add counterclaims and Exhibit A to the Declaration of Andrea Nil Sanchez. ECF 191 at 1. This information has been designated confidential or highly confidential by Cisco. *Id.* As the designating party, Cisco filed a declaration indicating that this material contains confidential customer research, product development plans, and internal assessments of Arista’s products and strategy. Cannon Declaration at ¶¶ 5-7, ECF 209. According to Cisco, the disclosure of this information would harm Cisco’s business. *Id.* The Court finds the sealing request to be narrowly tailored. Accordingly, the Court GRANTS Arista’s motion to seal.

III. ORDER

For the foregoing reasons, the sealing motion at ECF 191 is GRANTED Under Civil Local Rule 79-5(e)(2), for any request that has been denied because the party designating a document as confidential or subject to a protective order has not provided sufficient reasons to seal, the submitting party must file the unredacted (or lesser redacted) documents into the public record no earlier than 4 days and no later than 10 days from the filing of this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 1, 2016


BETH LABSON FREEMAN
United States District Judge